

NOV-107 AN ANSWER (1687) 108 WING-5-3261

ANSWER

To a late

DIALOGUE

Between a New

Catholick Convert

AND A

PROTESTANT,

To prove the MYSTERY of the TRINITY
to be as absurd a Doctrine as

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

By way of short Notes on the said Dialogue.

Licensed December 7th. 1686.

L O N D O N,

Printed for Thomas Basset at the George near St. Dunstan's
Church in Fleet-street. 1687.

36

A. M. S. W. E. H.

THE NEW YORK

LIBRARY

OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

100 N. 4th St. New York, N. Y.

1892

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
100 N. 4th St. New York, N. Y.

A
DIALOGUE
BETWEEN
(a) A New Catholick Convert,
AND A
PROTESTANT.

Concerning the Doctrines of the

Trinity and Transubstantiation.

(a) **T**HIS *new Catholick Convert* begins well, for the first thing he learns, is to believe the *Trinity* to be a groundless, absurd, and unreasonable Doctrine; and then to believe whatever the Church teaches, if it be not more absurd than the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; this is a great Improvement of Faith, which we *Protestants* can never attain to, for we cannot persuade our Understandings or our Faith to digest Absurdities: but let us hear their Dialogue.

A. You cannot imagine how much I am overjoy'd to see you. I have been big with Discourse these three days for want of Utterance. You may remember, when we talk'd together last, (b) we parted in a Dispute concerning *Transubstantiation* and the *holy Trinity*, of their equal Reasonableness and Authority. I must confess I was not at that time so thorowly arm'd with Reasons to shew you the Parallel: But since I have given my self a little leisure to consider of it, and I am perswaded I shall be able to give you Satisfaction.

(b) This is a little mistake, if we may guess at their last Discourse by this Dialogue; for the Design is not to prove, *That Transubstantiation and the holy Trinity have equal Reasonableness and Authority*, but that neither of them are reasonable, or have any Authority. Now though we may allow them to make as bold with Transubstantiation as they please, yet we cannot but be sensible of that Dishonour which is done to common Christianity, by exposing the most sacred and venerable Mystery of it to the Scorn and Derision of Infidels and Hereticks. For sure they cannot think it any great credit to the Doctrine of the Trinity, that it cannot be proved, either by *Tradition, Scripture, or Reason*,

B. Sir, you know I am always glad of any Opportunity to gain your good Company, but especially upon so good an Occasion. I'll assure you, I am not, nor ever was, an Enemy to Catholick Communion; and if I had not so good a Cause, I should never suffer my self in that which without reasonable Grounds might be call'd a wilful Schism.

A. I have no reason to doubt your Integrity, and therefore shall not question that: I shall only desire the liberty to press my old Argument, (c) *That you would rely on the Authority of the Church*. I must confess, you have often question'd the doing of it; but I am sure, when you shall consider there are Mysteries as well as Doctrines in the Christian Religion, and when you know that (d) *Mysteries are not to be faith'd by Natural Reason*; you must needs conclude, that in some Cases your (e) *safest way is to trust Tradition*. Now certainly no one can give us so good an account of That, as the Church.

(c) This opens the Scene, and shews the whole design of this Dialogue, to bring men to rely on the Authority of the Church; and it is worth the while to consider, what a notable way this is. The new Convert perswades his Protestant Friend to fling away Sense, and Reason, and Scripture, and his own private Judgment, and to rely wholly on the Authority of the Church; for when these are out of the way, we may believe the Church in any thing. No, saies the Protestant, I can't believe that which is unreasonable and absurd, whoever tells it me. Convert, Don't you believe the Doctrine of the Trinity? Protest. Yes, very heartily. Convert. Why then Transubstantiation it self, which you Protestants make such a noise about

about, is not more unreasonable, and has as good foundation in Tradition and Scripture, as the Doctrine of the Trinity.

Protest. Say you so, my Friend, then why must I believe the Trinity? *Conv.* Because the Church teaches it, and for the same reason you must believe Transubstantiation. *Pro-*

test. Hold there, Sir! what if I will believe neither? then I hope I need not rely upon the Authority of the Church.

Conv. But you confess you must believe the Trinity. *Pro-*

test. Yes, if it be founded on Scripture and Tradition; and do not contradict the Reason of Mankind, as I have thought hitherto; but if you can persuade me otherwise, I will believe it no longer; unless you can tell me for what reason I must believe that, which I have no reason to believe. Wretched men! who care not what becomes of Christian Religion, if they can but establish the Authority of their Church; nay, care not how much they dishonour the Church itself; for it is no great Commendation of Church-Authority in matters of Faith, that the only use of it is to make men believe without Reason, or in contradiction to it. For it seems, were the Christian Faith reasonable, there were no need of relying on the Churches Authority, at least they would want one of the best Arguments to prove it.

(d) There are some Mysteries above Reason, none contrary to it, as Transubstantiation is.

(e) The universal Tradition of the Church, in conjunction with Scripture, I grant is a very good Foundation for our Faith; but what shall we do, when there is no certain Tradition, as he proves there is not for the Doctrine of the Trinity; for though we should allow, that the safest way is to receive these Traditions from the Church, yet we cannot receive them from her, if she have them not; and she cannot have them, if there be none; and we must conclude there are none, if they be not visible. For the Churches word; whatever Authority it have, is not Tradition.

B. But, Sir, to be short, What relation has this to the present Parallel of the Trinity and Transubstantiation? The Authority of the Church is another Point as disputable as That.

A. Very much; For as (f) *These two Doctrines have equal ground from*

from Scripture, Reason, and Tradition; so 'is there the same Obligation of your receiving one, as well as the other. And indeed I have since wonder'd at my own Profession, (g) *while a Protestant, so think how blind and partial I was*: But I must confess, because we are in a Dispute, it is better laying by such aggravating Circumstances; and indeed I cannot but be sensible what Prejudices such Discourses always make, and therefore I shall speak nothing more of that nature.

(f) That is none at all, as he attempts to prove; and if the Trinity have no better then Transubstantiation it has none, and then let him show how we are obliged to believe either, as I observed before.

(g) For what? for not believing Transubstantiation as well as the Trinity? Did he then, while a Protestant, believe the Doctrine of the Trinity to be as unreasonable, and to have no better Foundation in Scripture and Tradition then Transubstantiation? For otherwise he was not partial in believing one and rejecting the other, and if he did, he never understood his Religion, and then no wonder that he takes Sanctuary in a Church which requires no use of his understanding.

B. But to return to the main Point; I must tell you, I do not think them equally grounded on Scripture, Reason, or Tradition; and indeed you may remember that was the old Point in dispute with us.

A. (b) Well, Sir, to shew you your Error, I shall begin with the several Particulars in their Order; and so, first, as to the Tradition of Transubstantiation. Now 'tis evident That has been deliver'd with less interruption than that of the Holy Trinity: That Mystery was question'd in the very Infancy of the Church; nay, not only so, but the *Arians* prevail'd much against it about the beginning of the Fourth Age. On the other side, Transubstantiation lay unquestion'd and quiet a long time; and when it came to debate, there was no such opposition as that of *Arius*, to call in question the Authority of its Tradition; the Church receiv'd it unanimously, and in that sense continu'd, till rash Reason attempted to fathom the unlimited Miracles and Mysteries of God.

(b) Here is a great mixture of confidence and fallacy: Confidence is asserting what is false, that *Transubstantiation has been delivered with less interruption than that of the Holy Trinity*: for none of the Ancient Fathers make the least mention of it, neither the name nor the thing was known for many hundred

der'd years after Christ. He himself modestly grants, that the *Fathers* are not half so express in the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, as they are in the Mystery of the Holy Trinity: And when he grants half, you may safely conclude they say nothing of it: but the fallacy consists in attributing this silence of the Fathers about Transubstantiation to the unquestionableness of the Tradition, when it was wholly owing to the Ignorance of the Doctrine: It was not opposed in those days, because they never heard of Transubstantiation, not because it was universally believed; which is a reason indeed, why it should not be opposed, but not why it should never be mentioned. Whereas from that opposition, *Arius* and his followers made to the Doctrine of the Trinity, in the beginning of the Fourth Century, and that great alarm it gave immediately to the Christian Church; it is evident that it was the received Faith at and before that time; for otherwise *Arius* would not have opposed it, nor Catholick Bishops so Zealously have defended it.

B. But the Fathers are not half so express in the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, as they are in the Mystery of the Holy Trinity.

A. That's true, and there's very good Reason for it: Transubstantiation has not been a Doctrine so long in dispute, and 'tis not customary for Men to argue unquestionable Truths. And whereas you may think that Transubstantiation has of late receiv'd such shrewd Repulses by your Books, I'll assure you, you forget how much the true Catholick Zeal destroys the Seeds of Heresies. Do you think that so many Bishops, not only of the Eastern, but of the Western Church also, could be *Arians*, and yet suppose that that Opinion wanted (i) as Plausible a pretence of Tradition? Certainly if you consider that, you cannot think to establish the Doctrine of the Trinity by Tradition more than Transubstantiation; especially considering the strong Footsteps of that Sect even in the Fathers now extant. I would cite you some of them, but that they are not so much to my main Design, and indeed my aim is Brevity.

(i) *Arius* did not set up upon Tradition, but upon a pretence of Scripture and Reason, and if *Arianism* had had so good a pretence to Tradition, it is strange it should have been thought so new and surprizing a Doctrine at that time. It was

NEVER

never heard of before *Arian*, and that is proof enough that it was no Tradition of the Church, though afterwards they endeavoured to force some expressions in the Writings of the Ancient Fathers as well as of the Scriptures, to countenance that Blasphemous and damnable Opinion.

B. Well, Sir, 'tis true, we cannot so well plead Tradition to what you have urg'd; and especially when I call to mind, (1) that *Arrian* was confirm'd by a General Council; But we alledge an higher ground; we stand upon the Authority of the Scriptures, and indeed that is the true Foundation of all Doctrine.

(2) I hope he does not mean the Council of *Nice*, which was the first General Council; and assembled on purpose to Establish the Catholick Faith in this point, and to condemn *Arian*. And does the Church of *Rome* own any for a General Council, which confirmed *Arrianism*? The Council of *Syracusa* indeed, where *Liberius* Bishop of *Rome* Subscribed the *Arian* Confession, may bid fair for it, if a Council of Eastern and Western Bishops confirmed by the Pope, may pass for a General Council; but what then becomes of the Infallibility of Popes, and Councils, and Tradition? This is a desperate Man, who will not spare the Church of *Rome* her self, nor General Councils if they stand in his way, rather than allow any Tradition for the Doctrine of the Trinity.

A. 'Tis true, if you will follow the Catholick Church, (1) and take the Scriptures literally, you may discover the Mystery of the Holy Trinity in them; but if you once yield to Figurative Allusions and Interpretations, the *Arians* will be as much too hard for you, as you imagin your selves to be for the Catholick Church. (2) In short, both Doctrines will be at a loss, and both equally require the Authority of the Church to support them.

(3) If the Trinity can be prov'd by Scripture, that is all we desire, for I am sure Transubstantiation cannot; and as for literal or figurative Expositions of Scripture, neither of them must be always used, but as the Subject Matter and Circumstances of the place require.

(4) I thought the Christian Church had been built upon the Faith of the Holy Trinity, not that supported by the Authority of the Church, unless the Church can support her own Foundation.

Foundation; if there can be no Christian Church without Baptism in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that is, without professing the Faith and Worship of the ever blessed Trinity; this Doctrine must be believ'd before there can be any Church, on whose Authority we must believe it; and therefore he has chose the unfittest Doctrine to build on Church Authority that he could have thought on.

B. O no, surely the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity is more express in Scriptures than so.

A. To satisfy you that what I say is Truth, because I may represent the Parallel the clearer, (n) I will personate an Arian, that Sect so often condemn'd by the Ancient Church, and you shall see his Plea against the Trinity is as fair as yours against Transubstantiation. And because this is the main Parallel, I shall be somewhat the longer, that I may give you the greater satisfaction.

(n) An excellent part for a *Roman* Catholick to act. We read that the Devil sometimes transforms himself into an Angel of Light, but never that an Angel of Light transformed himself into a Devil. To Dispute seriously, and in good earnest against the Scripture Proofs of the Trinity, as he here does, though with no great understanding, I should think little better then Blasphemy; it is what would have never been endured in the Primitive Church, and which I think no Christians of any Communion ought to endure; for this is not the concernment of any particular Church, but of common Christianity. But though he can Personate an *Arian* so well, he should consider how he can dispute against him. He yields him all the Scripture Proofs for the Trinity, as not sufficient without the Authority of the Church; the *Arian* thanks him for giving the Scripture on his side, and is contented he should make the best he can of his Church Authority, and so continues an *Arian* still.

B. I shall be very glad to hear what you can speak to the matter.

A. (o) First then, I say, 'Tis highly unreasonable to interpret that Text, 1 John 5. 7. That there be Three in Heaven that bear record, and those Three are One; as likewise John 10. 30. I and my Father are One, literally; for if we do, we not only oppose Sense and Reason, but we make Construction directly against the very Scripture, John 10. 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38. and John 17. 21, 22, 23.

23. 1 Cor. 3. 8. And what can be urg'd more against us in respect of Transubstantiation?

B. Very right, Sir, that Interpretation carries a forcible Reasonableness, but the Doctrine of the Trinity do's not wholly depend upon those Two Proofs.

A. Right, it do's not; but I can give you further Demonstration in this Parellel. A principal Ground of the Trinity is because the Son is so often call'd God in Scripture, as *John* 1. 1, 2. *Rom.* 9. 5. &c. Now if we did not comply with the Catholick Church, and make a Literal Construction in this Case likewise, how strangely should we be confounded by those Texts (1) *where this Godhead in Christ is declar'd to be no more than Lordship, and subordinate to the Father*, as *Heb.* 1. 8. 9. 1 Cor. 8. 4, 5. 1 Cor. 15. 27, 28. *Rev.* 3. 12. and *John* 10. 35, 36.

B. But, Sir, our Saviour forgave Sins too.

A. That's true, but (2) *only by a deputed Authority*. You see when the Sons of Zebbedee petition'd him; he could not grant the final Accomplishment of our Spiritual Warfare, that was the Father's Prerogative, *Matth.* 20. 23. And tho' he is to be our Judge, yet he knows not the time, *Mark.* 13. 31. 1 *Tim.* 6. 15.

B. I must confess, these things a little surprize me; but however, I cannot think these neither the only Grounds that support that Mystery of the Trinity.

A. No, you are in the right; there is one strong Proof more; the making of all things visible and invisible is attributed to the Son, and that expressly, *John.* 1. 3. *Heb.* 1. 10 and particularly, *Col.* 1. 16, 17, 18, 19. But yet for all that, if we do not adhere with the Catholick Church to the Literal Interpretation, we are at a loss there too: For, first, 'tis plain by the rest of Scripture, (3) *that the Son is not our only Maker, as appears by our Creation attributed to the Father*; and then if we compare those Texts to *Heb.* 1. 2, 9, 10. 1 Cor. 8. 6. *Eph.* 3. 9. *Eph.* 4. 5, 6. 1 Cor. 15. 27, 28. we cannot reasonably attribute more to the Son, than his being God's Instrument in the Creation.

B. But are these the true and only Grounds of the Doctrine of that Holy Mystery?

A. Yes verily; for, (4) *that we are Baptiz'd in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is no Argument. That were as reasonable, if understood of Christ and the Holy Ghost, as our Spiritual Governours, as under the supposal of their being Co-equal with the Father*, 1 Cor. 10. 2. 1 Cor. 12. 12, 13.

(5) I do not think this a proper place, nor a just occasion to enter into the dispute of the Trinity. What he here alleges,

ledges, has been answered a hundred times over, both by the ancient Fathers and Modern Writers, both Romanist and Protestants; and if he dare say, when he has taken off his *Arian Vizard*, that they are not well, and sufficiently answered, I will be bound to defend Catholick Christianity against this new kind of *Liberian Roman Catholick*. But it would move the Indignation of any good Christian, though a *Roman-Catholick*, to see so Sacred a Mystery made the Subject of Wit and Criticism, and little better then Drollery, (1) that Christ cannot be God, because he is Lord, as if he could not be God and Lord too; that he is not the Second Person in the Trinity, because he is not the first, and therefore as a Son, especially as a Mediator subordinate to his Father. (2) That he forgives Sins only as Priests do by a *deputed Authority*. (3) That he did not make the World, because the Father made it, and therefore he is but Gods Instrument in the Creation; as if in Creation, which is the immediate effect of Divine and Almighty Power, there could be any created Instrument. (4) That we may be Baptized into the Name of the Son and Holy Ghost, as Spiritual Governours, when the Ancient Church thought this Form of Baptism to be the Foundation of the Creed, and there is no other difference expressed in the Form between *Baptising in the Name of the Father, and of the Son and Holy Ghost*, but the order of Persons.

B. But surely, Sir, the *Arians* should have other Grounds to establish their Opinions, besides those, or else your Parellel with Transubstantiation will not be so demonstrable as you conceive. Pray inform me a little further, I have a mighty desire to understand a little better their Fundamental Principles.

A. To satisfy you, I shall. (p) First, They alledge Christ represented under the Law altogether as an Angel; for Eminency call'd the Angel of the Presence, *Isa.* 63. 9. *Ecc.* 5. 6. *Gen.* 48. 15. *Num.* 20. 16. *Exod.* 23. 20, 21, 22. refer'd to 1 *Cor.* 10. 4, 5, 9. Further, they collect him to be a created Being, from *Col.* 1. 15. *Rev.* 3. 14. *Psal.* 118. 23. *Isa.* 45. 8. *Ecclus.* 1. 4, 9. *Ecclus.* 24. 9. *Sav.* 6. 22, 23. (q) And they interpret that Scripture, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee, by *Acts* 13. 33. and 2 *Pet.* 1. 17. As to (r) the Holy Ghost, they prove a vast distance between him and the Son, by *John* 16. 12, 13, 14, 15. and *John* 15. 26. Besides, they say, he is no where call'd God; and urge for the probability of their Opinion, *Rev.* 12. 9. *Rev.* 20. 8.

2 Cor. 4. 4. For as there is an universal tempting Evil Power, so we may reasonably conclude, there may be a Good Assisting Power, without any necessity of his being God. And further, where-ever in the Scriptures there is made any mention of the Three Persons, there is always declar'd an exprefs Gradation; as 1 Cor. 12. 3, 4, 5. 2 Cor. 13. 14. Gift and Communion from the Fellowship of the Holy Ghost, Grace and Administration from the Lordship and Kingship of Christ, and Love and Operation from the Father, the Supreme God, the Original Fountain, according to *Ephes. 4. 4, 5, 6.*

(p) That Christ is called in the Old Testament *the Angel of the presence*, I grant, but affirm also, that *the Angel of the presence* was no created Angel, but the Lord *Jehovah*, who spake to *Moses* in the Bush, as the Ancient Fathers grant.

(q) To be the first born of every Creature, does not prove that he is a Creature, but that he was begotten of God before any Creatures were made, that is, before the Creation of the World, and that signifies an Eternal Generation; for nothing was before the Creation of the World, but that which is Eternal and uncreated, as is sufficiently intimated in this very Text, 1 Col. 16. 17, 18. and then it is no injury to the Eternal Generation of Christ; though we grant that he was begotten again at his Resurrection from the Dead.

(r) As for the Holy Spirit, he is indeed called the Spirit of Christ, and is said to be sent by Christ, as he is by his Father; but this proves only that he is the Third Person in the Trinity, and in the Economy of Mans Salvation, acts as a Vicarious power to Christ the Redeemer. But his very Office to Inspire and Sanctifie, and dwell in the whole Christian Church, and every Christian proves him to be God; not only because the Christian Church and Christians are his Temple, but because no Created Spirit can dwell in all Christians. For what this Convert alledges of *an universal tempting evil power*, is no better than *Manichism*, or to assert an evil God. For an universal power is a God; and did one Devil tempt and possesse all bad Men, as one and the same Holy Spirit dwells in all good Men, he would be an omnipresent and infinite Devil, which is what the *Manichees* call an evil God, and sure this is not the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, which is a sign that our Author is but a new Convert.

B. I must confess, Sir, these Opinions seem to make it necessary for us in that Doctrine too, to trust to the Authority of the Catholick Church, and I shall take time to consider a little upon them: But pray, Sir, what say you to the Reasons of the two Doctrines?

A. Really, (f) Sir, I must tell you, I think that Parallel much the easiest. 'Tis strange new Arithmetick to a man, to tell him, Three distinct Persons are one and the same Individual Nature, and then to call such a one the most Pure and Simple Being; and that especially when they are declar'd to have various Intellectual Powers, as appears by *John* 16. 12, 13, 14, 15. and *Mark* 13. 31. *1 Tim.* 6. 15. *Acts* 1. 7. For my part, I cannot tell well how the Prejudice of Education could possibly digest a thing so unreasonable, were it not a Divine Mystery. I am sure, (t) to my carnal Reason, there may be as well Three Hundred Persons in the Godhead, as Three; and I know not what can be said of Transubstantiation, that is seemingly more absurd than That.

B. I must confess, Sir, I have had strange, confus'd, and surprising Thoughts of it my self; but I always apprehended the Christian Church a sufficient Guide.

A. If you did, Sir, pray consider who that Catholick Mother is you so obey'd; and as you have receiv'd the Trinity, so receive a Doctrine equally as reasonable, and deliver'd by Her, *Transubstantiation*. I know the Ingenuoufness of your Temper, and you promis'd me at first not to be a wilful Schismatick; and therefore I have hopes my Reasons, and your Consideration, will be sufficient to reduce you to Catholick Communion.

B. Sir, I shall consider of it; but as yet you only talk'd to me at large: I shall desire one Favour of you before we part; Pray state the Parallel a little shorter, I shall the better remember it.

A. Well, Sir, I shall. First, the Tradition of one Doctrine cannot be stronger than another, where both have been at least equally question'd. Secondly, 'Tis as reasonable to take *This is my Body*, literally, as it is to take these Texts, *I and my Father are one God over all blessed for ever*; and *By him all things were made*, without reference to other Scriptures, and a Figurative Interpretation. And lastly, I think to human Reason 'tis as equally unreasonable, and as seemingly repugnant, to say One is Three, as it is to say a Body is not what it appears.

B. Very well, I shall desire no more of you now: I'll only take a little time to consider, and then you shall know my mind more freely.

A. Farewel; and God give you his Holy Spirit to instruct you.

(f) And now we are come to the main Point, Whether the Doctrine of the Trinity be as absurd and contradictory as the Doctrine

Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, which God forbid it should be." I am sure *the Arithmetick* is very good ; for Three Persons and one Nature, is no bad Arithmetick. To say, that there are Three Persons and but One Person, and but One Nature, and yet Three Natures, had been no good Arithmetick, but a plain Contradiction, that Three are One, and One Three in the same respect, which God himself cannot make true; but Three Persons and One Nature is no Contradiction, how incomprehensible soever it may be. He has made it a Contradiction indeed by saying, That *Three distinct Persons are one and the same Individual Nature* ; but whoever before said, that the Person is the Nature, or that the Divine Nature is an individual Nature, or a Nature appropriated to one Person, which is the signification of an individual Nature. I suppose he had heard somewhere of *individua Trinitas*, and this he mistook for an individual Nature. These are indeed Contradictions, and new invented Heresies, but this is not the Catholick Doctrine of the *Trinity*.

(t) We cannot indeed comprehend how Three distinct Persons should subsist in one Nature, for we see no example of it in Nature ; for in finite Creatures, one finite Nature is confined to one Person; but a finite Nature, I hope, is no rule for an infinite Nature, and therefore an infinite Nature may be common to more Persons than one, though a finite Nature cannot ; and it may be, it is as intelligible how Three distinct Persons may subsist in one infinite Nature, as how three distinct Faculties can be in the same finite Soul ; by which Comparison the Ancients explain'd the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. The Omnipresence, Omniscience, Omnipotence, Eternity of God, are as much above our Comprehension, as a Plurality of Persons in the Deity ; and if men will but allow, that God is incomprehensible, this can be no Objection against the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. Natural Reason indeed cannot discover the Plurality of Persons in the Godhead, and therefore I can give no Reason why there should be Three Persons, and neither more nor less ; as the Plurality of Persons, so the number of them depends wholly upon Revelation ; and the Scripture assures me, there are but Three, and therefore I believe no more.

And

And because there are no more, therefore I believe it is impious to say, *That there may be as well Three Hundred Persons in the Godhead, as Three.*

Thus the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, tho it be above the comprehension of our finite minds, as every thing must be, which is infinite, yet it does not contradict any necessary Principle of Reason; as *Transubstantiation* does, which is contrary to Sense and Reason. Whether any Body be Bread or Flesh, fall under the notice of Sense, and therefore our Senses must judge of it; and all our Senses tell us, that the consecrated Bread and Wine, is Bread and Wine still, not Flesh and Blood; so that we have greater evidence against *Transubstantiation*, than we can have against the *Trinity*; for we have the evidence of Sense, that it is not Flesh, but Bread; and no man can pretend to such evidence as this, that there are not Three Divine Persons in the Godhead, and this makes some difference between them.

As for Reason, if we cannot understand, what the Properties of a Body are, we can know nothing; and therefore this is a proper Object of human Reason, though the *Trinity* is not; and if our Reason discover a great many Absurdities, and Contradictions, and Impossibilities in *Transubstantiation*, we must confess, that it is absurd and impossible, as to take notice of some few.

To say that the Substance of the Bread is turned into the natural Flesh of Christ, which suffered on the Cross sixteen hundred years ago, is to say, that the Body of Christ is made to day, which was 1600 years ago, which is a Contradiction; for what was made 1600 years ago, cannot be made to day, unless it was 1600 years before it was made; or was made 1600 years after it was made, and thus the same individual Body must be, and not be at the same time.

It is essential to the same Body to be but in one place at a time, and yet all confess, that the Body of Christ is whole and intire in Heaven, how then is the same Body at the same time on the Altar? nay, on as many Altars as there are in the Christian World, at the same time.

The Body of Christ in Heaven has the just Proportions and Dimensions of a human Body; in the consecrated Host it is

with-

without any extension or distinction of parts; whole and entire in the least Crumb of Bread; now for the same individual Body to be extended, and not extended at the same time, is a contradiction; and tho' we could suppose that Christ could bestow such a supernatural kind of Existence on his Body, as to subsist without Extension of parts, yet how can the same Body at the same time be extended and not extended, as it must be, if the same Body be extended in Heaven, and not extended in the Host. The Sacramental Body of Christ is clothed with the Species of Bread, is it so in Heaven too? if not, how is the same Body at the same time, with and without the Species of Bread? The Sacramental Body of Christ is his dead and broken Body; the Body of Christ in Heaven is a living glorified Body; now if this be the same Body, the same Body must be dead and alive, broken and whole at the same time.

The *Romanists* tell us, that the consecrated Bread is the whole Body of Christ, Flesh and Blood too, which must go together; and yet that the consecrated Cup is the natural Blood of Christ shed out of his Body; so that it seems, the same Body on the Altar is both broken and whole, and the same Blood is in his Veins, and poured out of them at the same time. Now I would ask, Whether Christ in Heaven have any Blood, which is separated from his Body; if he have not, then how is the consecrated Cup, which is his Blood shed for us, and therefore out of his Body, that natural Blood which Christ now has in Heaven, where to be sure, he has no Blood, which is out of his Body, and therefore that Blood, which is out of his Body, cannot be his natural Blood, which he now has in Heaven.

When our Author has digested these Absurdities and Contradictions, I can easily furnish him with more; and can there be a greater contempt of the ever blessed Trinity, than to compare so sacred and venerable a Mystery, to the most absurd Doctrine, which was ever invented by Men.

It will be in vain to pray to God to give us his Holy Spirit to instruct us, till we first learn to believe our own Sense and Reason.

The E N D.